

Instructions for Using the Plan Review Crosswalk for Review of Local Mitigation Plans

Attached is a Plan Review Crosswalk based on the *Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance Under the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000*, published by FEMA, dated March 2004. This Plan Review Crosswalk is consistent with the *Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000* (P.L. 106-390), enacted October 30, 2000 and *44 CFR Part 201 – Mitigation Planning, Interim Final Rule* (the Rule), published February 26, 2002.

SCORING SYSTEM

N – Needs Improvement: The plan does not meet the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments must be provided.

S – Satisfactory: The plan meets the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments are encouraged, but not required.

Each requirement includes separate elements. All elements of a requirement must be rated "Satisfactory" in order for the requirement to be fulfilled and receive a summary score of "Satisfactory." A "Needs Improvement" score on elements shaded in gray (recommended but not required) will not preclude the plan from passing.

When reviewing single jurisdiction plans, reviewers may want to put an N/A in the boxes for multi-jurisdictional plan requirements. When reviewing multi-jurisdictional plans, reviewers may want to put an N/A in the prerequisite box for single jurisdiction plans.

States that have additional requirements can add them in the appropriate sections of the *Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance* or create a new section and modify this Plan Review Crosswalk to record the score for those requirements.

Optional matrices for assisting in the review of sections on profiling hazards, assessing vulnerability, and identifying and analyzing mitigation actions are found at the end of the Plan Review Crosswalk.

The example below illustrates how to fill in the Plan Review Crosswalk.

Example

Assessing Vulnerability: Overview

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii): [The risk assessment *shall* include a] description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to the hazards described in paragraph (c)(2)(i) of this section. This description *shall* include an overall summary of each hazard and its impact on the community.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan include an overall summary description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to each hazard?	Section II, pp. 4-10	The plan describes the types of assets that are located within geographically defined hazard areas as well as those that would be affected by winter storms.		✓
B. Does the plan address the impact of each hazard on the jurisdiction?	Section II, pp. 10-20	The plan does not address the impact of two of the five hazards addressed in the plan. Required Revisions: • Include a description of the impact of floods and earthquakes on the assets. Recommended Revisions: • This information can be presented in terms of dollar value or percentages of damage.	✓	
SUMMARY SCORE			✓	

Jurisdiction: **Fallon County, MT****Local Mitigation Plan Review and Approval Status**

Jurisdiction: Fallon County, MT	Title of Plan: Community Wildfire Protection and Pre-Disaster Mitigation Plan	Date of Plan: November 2005
Local Point of Contact: Sam Thielen	Address: 10 West Fallon P.O. Box 846 Baker, MT 59313	
Title: Disaster and Emergency Services Coordinator		
Agency: Fallon County, Montana		
Phone Number: 406-778-3233	E-Mail: fcdes@midrivers.com	

State Reviewer: Kent Atwood	Title: State Hazard Mitigation Officer	Date: March 16, 2006
---------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

FEMA Reviewer: Diana Heyder Ken Crawford Jennifer Fee	Title: Mitigation Specialist Mitigation Specialist Planner	Date: March 21, 2006 March 24, 2006 March 30, 2006
Date Received in FEMA Region VIII	March 20, 2006	
Plan Not Approved		
Plan Approved	XXX	
Date Approved	April 4, 2006	

Jurisdiction:	NFIP Status*			
	Y	N	N/A	CRS Class
1. Fallon County, MT (mapped 8/4/88)	X			
2. City of Baker, MT (mapped 8/4/88)	X			
3. Town of Plevna, MT (not incorporated)				
5. [ATTACH PAGE(S) WITH ADDITIONAL JURISDICTIONS]				

* Notes: Y = Participating N = Not Participating N/A = Not Mapped

Jurisdiction: **Fallon County, MT**

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW SUMMARY

The plan cannot be approved if the plan has not been formally adopted.

Each requirement includes separate elements. All elements of the requirement must be rated "Satisfactory" in order for the requirement to be fulfilled and receive a score of "Satisfactory." Elements of each requirement are listed on the following pages of the Plan Review Crosswalk. A "Needs Improvement" score on elements shaded in gray (recommended but not required) will not preclude the plan from passing. Reviewer's comments must be provided for requirements receiving a "Needs Improvement" score.

SCORING SYSTEM

Please check one of the following for each requirement.

N – Needs Improvement: The plan does not meet the minimum for the requirement.

Reviewer's comments must be provided.

S – Satisfactory: The plan meets the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments are encouraged, but not required.

Prerequisite(s) (Check Applicable Box)

Adoption by the Local Governing Body:
§201.6(c)(5) **OR**

NOT MET	MET
	N/A

Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Adoption: §201.6(c)(5)
AND

Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Participation:
§201.6(a)(3)

	X
	X

Planning Process

Documentation of the Planning Process: §201.6(b)
and §201.6(c)(1)

N	S
	X

Risk Assessment

Identifying Hazards: §201.6(c)(2)(i)

Profiling Hazards: §201.6(c)(2)(i)

Assessing Vulnerability: Overview: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)

Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures:
§201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A)

Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential
Losses: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B)

Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development
Trends: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C)

Multi-Jurisdictional Risk Assessment:
§201.6(c)(2)(iii)

N	S
	X
	X
	X
X	
X	
X	
	X

Mitigation Strategy

Local Hazard Mitigation Goals: §201.6(c)(3)(i)

Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions:
§201.6(c)(3)(ii)

Implementation of Mitigation Actions:
§201.6(c)(3)(iii)

Multi-Jurisdictional Mitigation Actions:
§201.6(c)(3)(iv)

N	S
	X
	X
	X
	X

Plan Maintenance Process

Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan:
§201.6(c)(4)(i)

Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanisms:
§201.6(c)(4)(ii)

Continued Public Involvement: §201.6(c)(4)(iii)

N	S
	X
	X
	X

Additional State Requirements*

Insert State Requirement

Insert State Requirement

Insert State Requirement

N	S

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN APPROVAL STATUS

PLAN NOT APPROVED

☐

PLAN APPROVED

☐

*States that have additional requirements can add them in the appropriate sections of the *Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance* or create a new section and modify this Plan Review Crosswalk to record the score for those requirements.

See Reviewer's Comments

Jurisdiction: **Fallon County, MT**

PREREQUISITE(S)

Adoption by the Local Governing Body

Requirement §201.6(c)(5): [The local hazard mitigation plan **shall** include] documentation that the plan has been formally adopted by the governing body of the jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan (e.g., City Council, County Commissioner, Tribal Council).

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			NOT MET	MET
A. Has the local governing body adopted the plan?		N/A		
B. Is supporting documentation, such as a resolution, included?		N/A		
SUMMARY SCORE				N/A

Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Adoption

Requirement §201.6(c)(5): For multi-jurisdictional plans, each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan **must** document that it has been formally adopted.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			NOT MET	MET
A. Does the plan indicate the specific jurisdictions represented in the plan?	Executive Summary, page v	The plan serves Fallon County, and the incorporated jurisdiction of Baker and the unincorporated Town of Plevna.		X
B. For each jurisdiction, has the local governing body adopted the plan?	Page vi, vii, and viii	Each jurisdiction has adopted the plan.		X
C. Is supporting documentation, such as a resolution, included for each participating jurisdiction?	Page vi, vii, and viii	A copy of the adoption from each jurisdiction is included.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Participation

Requirement §201.6(a)(3): Multi-jurisdictional plans (e.g., watershed plans) may be accepted, as appropriate, as long as each jurisdiction has participated in the process ... Statewide plans will not be accepted as multi-jurisdictional plans.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			NOT MET	MET
A. Does the plan describe how each jurisdiction participated in the plan's development?	Section 1, page 2; Section II, page 1-2	The plan exhibits an excellent planning process. The plan indicates that each participating jurisdiction contributed to the development of the plan by: attending meetings, providing data, identifying mitigation projects, and setting project priorities. Three meetings were held in both Baker and Plevna. Meeting agendas, notes, sign in sheets, and news articles are provided		X

Jurisdiction: **Fallon County, MT**

		on pages II-8-37.		
			SUMMARY SCORE	X

PLANNING PROCESS: §201.6(b): *An open public involvement process is essential to the development of an effective plan.*

Documentation of the Planning Process

Requirement §201.6(b): *In order to develop a more comprehensive approach to reducing the effects of natural disasters, the planning process **shall** include:*

- (1) *An opportunity for the public to comment on the plan during the drafting stage and prior to plan approval;*
- (2) *An opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, and agencies that have the authority to regulate development, as well as businesses, academia and other private and non-profit interests to be involved in the planning process; and*
- (3) *Review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information.*

Requirement §201.6(c)(1): *[The plan **shall** document] the planning process used to develop the plan, including how it was prepared, who was involved in the process, and how the public was involved.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan provide a narrative description of the process followed to prepare the plan?	Section 1, page 2; Section II, page 1-2	A narrative description of the planning process is well documented and includes notes, agendas and sign-in sheets for all three meetings.		X
B. Does the plan indicate who was involved in the planning process? (For example, who led the development at the staff level and were there any external contributors such as contractors? Who participated on the plan committee, provided information, reviewed drafts, etc.?)	Section 1, page 2; Section II, page 1-2	The LEPC coordinated the planning effort in conjunction with the contractor and the County DES Coordinator. Barb Beck of Beck Consulting, County Disaster and Emergency Services Coordinator, participating jurisdictions, National Weather Service, and public input prepared the plan. Meeting agendas, notes, sign-in sheets, and news announcements are included in the plan.		X
C. Does the plan indicate how the public was involved? (Was the public provided an opportunity to comment on the plan during the drafting stage and prior to the plan approval?)	Section 1, page 2; Section II, page 1-2 and 9-37	Public involvement is well described and documented. The three meetings were advertised. The public was given an opportunity to comment during the drafting stage and prior to the plan approval.		X
D. Was there an opportunity for neighboring communities, agencies, businesses, academia, nonprofits, and other interested parties to be involved in the planning process?	Section 1, page 2; Section II, page 1-2 and 9-37	Three meetings were held that were open to the public and to neighboring communities and other interested parties. News articles in the Fallon Times, flyers posted around Baker and Plevna, personal phone calls, and e-mails were the primary means to inform the public. Pages II-3 – II-7 contains briefing paper correspondence interview form. Pages II-8 II-37 contains meeting agendas, notes, sign-in sheets, and news articles. The public meetings were well advertised through radio announcements and print news releases and were well		X

Jurisdiction: **Fallon County, MT**

E. Does the planning process describe the review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information?	Section III, page 1	attended. Numerous plans were reviewed. The plan notes a joint city-county growth policy that has a target completion date of December 2005. The plan indicates that several state and federal data bases were searched, including SHELDUS. In addition Fallon County Cooperative Fire Management Plan, BLM-Miles City Fire Management Plan, Montana Drought Response Plan, Soil and Survey of Fallon County, Montana Multi Hazard Mitigation Plan. Recommended Revisions for the five year update: Describe how the jurisdictions integrated information in the plan from existing plans, studies, and reports.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

RISK ASSESSMENT: §201.6(c)(2): *The plan shall include a risk assessment that provides the factual basis for activities proposed in the strategy to reduce losses from identified hazards. Local risk assessments must provide sufficient information to enable the jurisdiction to identify and prioritize appropriate mitigation actions to reduce losses from identified hazards.*

Identifying Hazards

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i): *[The risk assessment shall include a] description of the type ... of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan include a description of the types of all natural hazards that affect the jurisdiction? If the hazard identification omits (without explanation) any hazards commonly recognized as threats to the jurisdiction, this part of the plan cannot receive a Satisfactory score. Consult with the State Hazard Mitigation Officer to identify applicable hazards that may occur in the planning area.	Section III, page 4-25, 28-31; Section V, page 2-12	16 hazards are identified. The ranked hazards are: HazMat releases, Wildland fire, West Nile Virus, major power outage, (this should be looked at as a consequence of a hazard event-not as a separate risk), Blizzard/extended cold, and flooding, and Oil well blowout (HazMat issue?), and Dispatch Center Disaster, (this also should be looked at as a consequence of a hazard event-not a separate risk). Each hazard profile provides a description of the hazard potentially impacting the county. The plan includes information for all identified hazards The plan does a great job at including information from local newspapers and SHELDUS. For more information refer to SHELDUS (www.sheldus.org). A Flood Insurance Study is available for Fallon County,		X

Jurisdiction: **Fallon County, MT**

		<p>including incorporated cities. For more information refer to http://msc.fema.gov/.</p> <p>The plan indicates on page III-18 that there are a total of 37 dams in Fallon County. The National Inventory of Dams also indicates that there are 37 dams in Fallon County and two of them, Lower Baker Dam and Upper Baker Dam are high hazard dams. The National Dam Safety Act requires that an emergency action plan (EAP) be completed for high hazard dams. It appears that both of the high hazard dams do not have an EAP. Developing an EAP for Lower Baker Dam and Upper Baker Dam would be beneficial mitigation strategy. Please see http://crunch.tec.army.mil/nid/webpages/nid.cfm (introduction and download dam data) for National Dam Inventory information.</p> <p>Online EPA data suggests that there are no toxic release inventory sites in Fallon County. Please see http://www.epa.gov/triexplorer/ for more information.</p>		
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Profiling Hazards

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i): *[The risk assessment shall include a] description of the ... location and extent of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction. The plan shall include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the risk assessment identify the location (i.e., geographic area affected) of each natural hazard addressed in the plan?	Section III, page 1-31; section V, page 2-15	<p>The hazard profiles describe the geographical area of all identified hazards. The Community Wildfire Plan goes into great detail on the geological location under Individual Community Assessments.</p> <p>A matrix would be helpful it clarify the location of the hazards. The narrative section of each hazard addressed the location of the hazard, but it is not always clear. This is why a matrix would benefit the plan.</p>		X
B. Does the risk assessment identify the extent (i.e., magnitude or severity) of each hazard addressed in the plan?	Section III, page 1-31; section V, page 2-15	The magnitude of past events is highlighted in the hazard profiles and includes death, structure loss and associated costs when applicable. The plan also includes potential loss estimates for all identified hazards. This is another item that would be more clearly identified by a matrix to profile the		X

Jurisdiction: **Fallon County, MT**

		hazards.		
C. Does the plan provide information on previous occurrences of each hazard addressed in the plan?	Section III, page 1-31; section V, page 2-15	Previous occurrences of each type of hazard are addressed in the hazard profiles and include death, structure loss and associated costs when applicable. Recommended Revisions for the five year update: It may be helpful to develop a table that lists location of hazard, date, time, magnitude, death, injuries, property damage and/or crop damage.		X
D. Does the plan include the probability of future events (i.e., chance of occurrence) for each hazard addressed in the plan?	Section III, page 1-31; section V, page 2-15	Each hazard profile includes a statement regarding the probability of each event, based on previous frequency of past events.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Assessing Vulnerability: Overview

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii): [The risk assessment **shall** include a] description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to the hazards described in paragraph (c)(2)(i) of this section. This description **shall** include an overall summary of each hazard and its impact on the community.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan include an overall summary description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to each hazard?	Section III, page 1-31; section V, page 2-15	Each hazard profile discusses vulnerability in relation to potential losses and potential population losses. Page III-35 discusses vulnerable populations, providing location and the number of individuals, although they do not appear to be in relation to hazard areas. Recommended Revision for the five year update: Identify vulnerable populations in relation to hazard areas.		X
B. Does the plan address the impact of each hazard on the jurisdiction?	Section III, page 1-31; section V, page 2-15	The hazard profiles identify past events related to location, which include the impacts in terms of loss structures, injuries, deaths, and costs when applicable. In addition each hazard includes a table that discusses estimate of potential loss. The CWPP includes extensive information on the impacts from wildfire on individual communities.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Jurisdiction: **Fallon County, MT**

Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A): The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of existing and future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard area

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of existing buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?		<p>The plan includes a list of critical facilities in table 3.9, which includes a description and insured value. The plan does not identify the types and number of existing buildings and infrastructure. The plan also includes a map depicting the critical facilities for all participating jurisdictions. To meet this requirement the plan must also identify existing buildings and infrastructure and make a connection to identified hazards.</p> <p>Recommended Revisions for the five year update: For each hazard, identify the type and number of existing buildings and infrastructure in addition to critical facilities within each hazard area.</p> <p>While not required by the Rule, it is useful to inventory structures located within areas that have repeatedly flooded and collect information on past insurance claims. At a minimum, describe repetitive loss neighborhoods or areas in the plan.</p> <p>For a discussion on identifying vulnerable structures and detailed inventories, see <i>Understanding Your Risks</i> (FEMA 386-2), Step 3, Worksheet #3a and #3b, Inventory Assets.</p> <p>Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</p>	X	
B. Does the plan describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?		<p>The plan does not discuss types and numbers of future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities.</p> <p>Recommended Revisions: For each hazard identify the type and number of future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities within each hazard area.</p> <p>Additional Suggestions: Identify the types of buildings (e.g., residential, commercial, institutional, recreational, industrial, and municipal buildings), infrastructure (e.g., roadways, bridges, utilities, and</p>	X	

Jurisdiction: **Fallon County, MT**

		<p>communications systems), and critical facilities (e.g., shelters, hospitals, police, and fire stations). Identify buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities that are vulnerable to more than one hazard. Describe the process or method used for identifying future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities. Note any data limitations for determining the type and numbers of future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities and include in the mitigation strategy actions for collecting the data to improve future vulnerability assessment efforts. For a discussion on identifying vulnerable structures and detailed inventories, see <i>Understanding Your Risks</i> (FEMA 386-2), Step 3, Worksheet #3a and #3b, Inventory Assets.</p> <p>Note: A “Needs Improvement” score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</p>		
		SUMMARY SCORE	X	

Jurisdiction: **Fallon County, MT**

Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B): *[The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of an] estimate of the potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures identified in paragraph (c)(2)(i)(A) of this section and a description of the methodology used to prepare the estimate*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan estimate potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures?		<p>The plan does include an estimate of potential dollar loss on page III-32-III-36. The critical facilities identified on page III-32 list the insured value, which is the estimated replacement value in the event of a complete loss. Although this is a great start, future losses would have to be addressed to fully satisfy this requirement.</p> <p>Recommended Revisions for the five year update:</p> <p>Please include future dollar losses to vulnerable structures.</p> <p>Include, when resources permit, estimates for structure, contents, and function losses to present a full picture of the total loss for each building, infrastructure, and critical facility.</p> <p>Include a composite loss map to locate high potential loss areas to help the jurisdiction focus its mitigation priorities.</p> <p>Note any data limitations for estimating losses and include in the mitigation strategy actions for collecting the data to improve future loss estimate efforts.</p> <p>For a step-by-step method for estimating losses, see <i>Understanding Your Risks</i> (FEMA 386-2), Step 4.</p> <p>Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</p>	X	
B. Does the plan describe the methodology used to prepare the estimate?		<p>The plan does not include the methodology used to prepare the estimates.</p> <p>Recommended Revisions for the five year update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe the methodology used to estimate losses. <p>For a step-by-step method for estimating losses, see <i>Understanding Your Risks</i> (FEMA 386-2), Step 4.</p> <p>Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</p>	X	

SUMMARY SCORE

X

Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development Trends

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C): [The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of] providing a general description of land uses and development trends within the community so that mitigation options can be considered in future land use decisions.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan describe land uses and development trends?	Section I, page 4; Section III, page 1-31, "Section V, page 6-8.	<p>Land Use and development trends are discussed in general terms and states that the population is decreasing at the beginning of the plan, however there are hazards identified as affecting the entire county. The plan needs to include population projections and growth in relation to other identified hazard areas so that mitigation options can be considered in future land use decisions.</p> <p>Recommended Revisions for the five year update:</p> <p>An extensive description of land uses and development trends for wildfire is found within the plan. The plan would benefit from including these descriptions for all applicable hazards.</p> <p>Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</p>	X	
SUMMARY SCORE			X	

Multi-Jurisdictional Risk Assessment

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(iii): For multi-jurisdictional plans, the risk assessment **must** assess each jurisdiction's risks where they vary from the risks facing the entire planning area.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan include a risk assessment for each participating jurisdiction as needed to reflect unique or varied risks?	Executive Summary, page iv; Section III, page 1-31; Section V, page 6-8	<p>The plan does include a summary of where risks vary by jurisdiction on page iv, summarizing hazards that have the most affect on each participating jurisdiction. In addition each hazard profile under vulnerability lists jurisdictions that are most susceptible to the identified hazard.</p> <p>The CWPP includes Individual Community Assessments, which identifies jurisdictions most at risk to fire hazards.</p>		X

Jurisdiction: **Fallon County, MT**

		Recommended Revision for the five year update: Prepare a summary of the various jurisdictions that describe only the risk that vary.		
SUMMARY SCORE				X

MITIGATION STRATEGY: §201.6(c)(3): *The plan shall include a mitigation strategy that provides the jurisdiction's blueprint for reducing the potential losses identified in the risk assessment, based on existing authorities, policies, programs and resources, and its ability to expand on and improve these existing tools.*

Local Hazard Mitigation Goals

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i): *[The hazard mitigation strategy shall include a] description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A Does the plan include a description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards? (GOALS are long-term; represent what the community wants to achieve, such as "eliminate flood damage"; and are based on the risk assessment findings.)	Section IV page 2-5; Section V, page 21-23.	Five goals are identified in the Multi-hazard plan. Interesting to note that the number one goal addresses flooding, but that hazard was ranked at #4. There does not appear to be a link between the hazard assessment and the goals. Seven goals are identified in the Wildfire plan. In the next revision this should be addressed.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii): *[The mitigation strategy shall include a] section that identifies and analyzes a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects being considered to reduce the effects of each hazard, with particular emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan identify and analyze a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects for each hazard?	Section IV, page 2-5; Section V, page 21-23	Mitigation actions are identified for each hazard. A number of projects will benefit county at large and all participating jurisdictions, based on the size of the county and close proximity and cooperation of the participating partners this seems appropriate for this size plan.		X
B Do the identified actions and projects address reducing the effects of hazards on new buildings and infrastructure?	Section IV, page 2-5; Section I, page 4	The plan includes two projects that address reducing effects of hazards on new buildings, which are to enforce existing floodplain regulations and to provide the public with floodplain requirements.		X
C. Do the identified actions and projects address reducing the effects of hazards on existing	Section IV, page 2-5; Section I,	The plan includes several projects that would protect existing buildings and infrastructure. These projects include: enforce		X

Jurisdiction: **Fallon County, MT**

buildings and infrastructure?	page 4	existing floodplain regulations, provide the public with floodplain requirements, and the Highway 7 drainage project. The CWPP also list several mitigation projects for existing structures related to fire hazard.		
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Implementation of Mitigation Actions

Requirement: §201.6(c)(3)(iii): *[The mitigation strategy section shall include] an action plan describing how the actions identified in section (c)(3)(ii) will be prioritized, implemented, and administered by the local jurisdiction. Prioritization shall include a special emphasis on the extent to which benefits are maximized according to a cost benefit review of the proposed projects and their associated costs.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the mitigation strategy include how the actions are prioritized ? (For example, is there a discussion of the process and criteria used?)	Section IV, page 5-7; Section V, page 23	The plan does include the methodology for how the projects were prioritized. Meeting participants ranked each project as high, medium, and low priority against the following criteria: likelihood of a future occurrence, potential loss of life, potential property damage.		X
B. Does the mitigation strategy address how the actions will be implemented and administered ? (For example, does it identify the responsible department, existing and potential resources, and timeframe?)	Section IV, page 7-8, Section V page 24-25	Marginally met. The plan includes a description of project implementation and generally discusses who would be responsible. Table 4.1 identifies a schedule, potential resources, and cost benefits. Recommended Revisions for the five year update: The plan would be enhanced if Table 4.1 included a responsible department that would oversee the identified projects. Several potential oversights are identified on page IV-7 that could be matched with the identified projects.		X
C. Does the prioritization process include an emphasis on the use of a cost-benefit review (see page 3-36 of <i>Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance</i>) to maximize benefits?	Section IV, page	Marginally met. Table 4.1 includes cost/benefit column and is in relation to dollar amount and property saved. The plan includes a discussion on putting an emphasis on benefits compared to costs for the projects when they are developed, although the plan does not indicate when or how the use of the cost-benefit review occurred to prioritize the mitigation measures presented in the plan. The project ranking section on page IV-5 needs to consider benefit and cost as part of the ranking criteria. Recommended Revisions for the five year update: Describe the cost-benefit review and how it was emphasized		X

Jurisdiction: **Fallon County, MT**

		during the prioritization process to identify actions/projects with the greatest benefits. (If cost and benefit data are unavailable, a qualitative assessment of the comparative benefits will suffice.) For a detailed description of the development of the mitigation strategy or action plan, see <i>Developing the Mitigation Plan</i> (FEMA 386-3), Step 3; and <i>Mitigation Benefit-Cost Analysis (BCA) Toolkit Compact Disc (CD)</i> .		
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Multi-Jurisdictional Mitigation Actions

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iv): For multi-jurisdictional plans, there **must** be identifiable action items specific to the jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval or credit of the plan.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A Does the plan include at least one identifiable action item for each jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval of the plan?	Section IV, page 6-7; Section V, page 23-34	Action items are identified for Plevna, Baker, and the county. The participating jurisdictions are identified as potential resources for the project and it appears that the three jurisdictions will be engaged in the identified projects.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

PLAN MAINTENANCE PROCESS

Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan

Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(i): [The plan maintenance process **shall** include a] section describing the method and schedule of monitoring, evaluating, and updating the mitigation plan within a five-year cycle.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan describe the method and schedule for monitoring the plan? (For example, does it identify the party responsible for monitoring and include a schedule for reports, site visits, phone calls, and meetings?)	Section VI page 1-2	The County DES Coordinator is responsible for updating the plan, after a disaster, or every five years. The Fallon County Commissioners will be responsible for monitoring the plan. The co-leads for monitoring the plan are Fallon County Disaster and Emergency Services Coordinator. A schedule includes three situations that would trigger the review of the plan.		X
B. Does the plan describe the method and schedule for evaluating the plan? (For example, does it identify the	Section VI, page 1-2	Four items are identified under Criteria for Evaluating the Plan. An annual review will take place every January beginning 2007,		X

Jurisdiction: **Fallon County, MT**

party responsible for evaluating the plan and include the criteria used to evaluate the plan?)		with the LEPC.		
C. Does the plan describe the method and schedule for updating the plan within the five-year cycle?	Section VI, page 1-2	Every five years, beginning in 2011, the CWPP/PDM will be submitted to MT DES and then FEMA.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanisms

Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(ii): *[The plan shall include a] process by which local governments incorporate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan identify other local planning mechanisms available for incorporating the requirements of the mitigation plan?	Section VI, page 2	Several other plans were identified: Joint Growth Policy with City of Baker and the County, subdivision regulations, the EOP, and the enhanced 9-1-1 systems.		X
B. Does the plan include a process by which the local government will incorporate the requirements in other plans, when appropriate?	Section VI, page 1-2	This is discussed for the EOP, and the enhanced 9-1-1 system, but not the subdivision regulations, or the Joint Growth Policy that is still in process. The Growth Policy appears to be an obvious omission that should be addressed.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Continued Public Involvement

Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(iii): *[The plan maintenance process shall include a] discussion on how the community will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan explain how continued public participation will be obtained? (For example, will there be public notices, an on-going mitigation plan committee, or annual review meetings with stakeholders?)	Section VI, page 1-2	The plan indicates that the LEPC meetings will be noticed in the Fallon County Times and the public will be encouraged to attend.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X